

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

LORUWE LUKUDA LUMANGA,)

4:13CV3212

Plaintiff,)

v.)

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

SPLA/SPLM, SALVER KIRR, DR.)

RAEH MANSHAR, SUDAN SSTV)

2, RODOLPH, KAY ALEX)

GANDER, DON RINOH, CWS)

U.SA, BILL CLINTON, OMAR EL)

BASHIR, DOOD MOHAMAD,)

CHARLIE SESSION REED, Kaplan)

Univ Teacher, KAWUNDA AUDIO,)

KAWUNDA JOHN LODO)

MOGGA, JOHN MENA JESHUA,)

SEPUREN LUKUDU ZACHARIA,)

Teacher, J. PATRICK MULLEN,)

GOI KONYI JOSEPH, Douglas)

Correction omaha, NE, REGIONAL)

CENTER, Corrections Omaha, J.)

PATRICK MULLENS, Judge, and)

PEDAR BARTLING, Ass, Attorney,)

Defendants.)

This matter is before the court on a document filed by Plaintiff on October 23, 2014. (*See* Filing No. [15](#).) The document is nonsensical, and the court cannot decipher what relief Plaintiff seeks. To the extent Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the court's order dismissing this matter without prejudice, his request is denied

because Plaintiff has set forth no reason why the court should reconsider any portion of its order.¹

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: The clerk's office is directed to term the motion event appearing at Filing Number 15. To the extent Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the court's Memorandum and Order dated May 21, 2014, his request is denied.

DATED this 1st day of December, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ John M. Gerrard
United States District Judge

¹The court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint on May 21, 2014, because Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by May 12, 2014. (*See* Filing No. [13](#).) Like the document at issue here, Plaintiff's Complaint is nonsensical and nearly impossible to decipher.

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.